DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 341 269 FL 020 039

AUTHOR Lambert, Wallace E.
TITLE Issues in Foreign Language and Second Language Education.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Sep 90
NOTE 40p.; In: Proceedings of the Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues (1st, Washington, DC, September 10-12, 1990); see FL 020 030.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education Programs; Comparative Analysis; Cooperative Programs; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; *Language Teachers; Limited English Speaking; *Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Programs

ABSTRACT

Distinctions are made between foreign language (FL) and second language (SL) teaching and learning. It is suggested that several major issues emerging in FL and SL education in the United States must be considered before substantive improvements can be made in the FL or SL competence of both native English speakers and those whose native language is other than English. The issues to be resolved include the following: (1) FL and SL professionals have substantially different aims, orientations, and training and their offerings are directed to different populations of users; (2) there is a more serious demand by those being educated for higher levels of competence in foreign language and second languages than usually occurs in school-based education programs; and (3) there are time constraints, since no extra time can be directed to language education if it curtails the comprehensive education in math, sciences, humanities, and social sciences needed in today's technical and international world markets. The integration of the talents of both FL and SL professionals and educational approaches is advocated. It is suggested that two-way bilingual immersion education programs can simultaneously enhance the language competency of both native and non-native English students without shortchanging them on basic educational needs. Contains 72 references. (LB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED341269

ISSUES IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND SECOND LANGUAGE EDUCATION

Wallace E. Lambert

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

When asked to write a substantial paper around this title, I was at first perplexed because I had blurred any distinctions between a "foreign" and a "second" language and used the terms interchangeably.

In research on bilingualism, the major issue for me has been which language is acquired first and which second. Relative to the "native language" or the "mother tongue," any language, whether it is a "foreign" or a "second," comes second, except for the fascinating cases in which two languages are acquired simultaneously in infancy. Working in Canada also contributes to a simplification of the distinction between the terms. In Canada there are two official national languages, and either French or English can be a first language for large numbers of Canadians. Learning the other national language would make either one of them the "second" language, even though in certain parts of the country either one could be as "foreign" a language as Spanish or Greek would be. The distinction begins to emerge when one thinks of the United States, where English is the only national language and where, in oversimplified terms, if English isn't a person's home language then he/she is expected to make it his/her "second" language, whereas if English is the home language, any other language one might learn is "foreign."

My purpose here is to bring out various distinctions between these two terms and to relate the differences to the ways foreign languages (FLs) and second languages (SLs) are supplied, by school authorities and teachers, to young people in schools and colleges who become the potential users of the offerings provided. The focus throughout will be on school based, formal teaching and learning of languages, not on informal, outside school sources of acquisition. Because there is usually more urgency involved in supplying SL than FL services, since SL users are under various forms of pressure to develop skills in English as quickly as possible, special attention will be directed to the SL case, although, it will be argued, one must give full consideration to the FL case because of the mutual benefits that can be generated when the concerns of SL and FL users are brought together in innovative educational programs. It will also be argued that there is a clear need for SL and FL program developers and teachers to learn and benefit from one another.

FL 020 039

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Comparisons of SL and FL Education

The common theme in SL and FL pedagogy is the fact that both forms focus on the teaching and learning of another language different from one's home language or mother tongue. As Ferguson (1990) puts it, the ultimate concern of both SL and FL suppliers is to enhance "the acquisition of non-mother tongues." The contrasts to be drawn in this paper will suggest that, other than this very general common feature, SL and FL education are fundamentally different. But before elaborating on these perceived differences, it is appropriate to signal and provide bibliographical references to the fact that there is no consensus in the field of language pedagogy on what the essential differences are, or even whether any differences are essential. An excellent overview is provided by Freed (1990) who basically argues that the similarities between FL and SL learning/acquisition outweigh the differences. Similarly, Gass (in press) and Kramsch (in press) are of the opinion that the learning of non-primary languages is a common field of enquiry that encompasses both SL and FL approaches. Others see the SL form as more inclusive. Thus, Ellis (1986) makes FL learning one form of SL learning, as does Littlewood (1984).

Others expand on the idea of a partial overlap of SL and FL learning approaches (e.g., Van Patten, 1988; Van Patten and Lee, in press), making SL learning/acquisition the common paradigm for classroom-based second language learning, classroom-based foreign language learning and outside school (untutored or natural) second language learning. Freed (1990) steps back from this argument and wonders whether the differences that are commonly stressed may, in practice, be essentially artificial. Likewise, Ferguson and Huebner (1989) conclude that the apparent differences may be matters of degree rather than of kind.

It is clear, then that there are various well-thought-through perspectives on SL and FL education and there is certainly room for yet another. The perspective developed in this paper, which places much greater emphasis on what I see as fundamental differences between SL and FL education, is an optique that takes preeminence if one considers the SL-FL debate from the vantage point of psycho- and sociolinguistics. For me, the SL and FL forms of education differ in their purposes, in the ways the practitioners of each form are trained and selected, in the backgrounds of the users of each form, in the concerns and preoccupations of those involved as teachers of each form, and in the impacts FL and SL suppliers have on special subgroups of users. These differences, it will be argued, have not only practical consequences but theoretical ones as well.

Permit me to characterize these contrasts through oversimplifications of my own creation that are overdrawn to make the basic differences stand out. For me, the essential differences are social in nature, not linguistic.

Contrasts in the Backgrounds of SL and FL Practitioners

In the United States, SL education has been developed over the years mainly for those who have a first language other than English at some level of proficiency and who must be brought up as quickly as possible to American norms in English, making it their second language. FL education has been developed for those who have English as their native language (their first language) and who are enticed in one manner or another to learn another language that is "foreign" in the context of the basically Anglo-Saxon, world that America was thought to be. Because the orientations of SL and FL forms of education differ, two quite different cadres of suppliers have evolved, and consequently the background training and ultimate selection of the practitioners of SL and FL education are typically different. SL practitioners are specialists in and technicians of language teaching/learning, usually with training in applied linguistics and/or TESL. They often become education authorities in state or federal agencies who make SL education an important part of their profession. FL practitioners, in contrast, are usually humanists, lovers of foreign treasure sites like Florence, Rome, Paris, Vienna, or pre-Mao China; usually they are primarily interested in literature, in story telling and story reading, and the stories they highlight are viewed as classics, the important exports from the old world to the new.

Contrasts in Purposes

These two groups of practitioners have quite different preoccupations. Those involved with the SL option are busy technically evaluating, linguistically analyzing and psycholinguistically experimenting so as to make palpable changes and improvements in SL delivery. In reaction to this flurry of SL activities, those involved with the FL option react cautiously, often by distancing themselves and by overemphasizing the humanistic, literary, and pure nature of a foreign language.

The purposes or aims of SL and FL education reflect these differences. Basically, the aim of SL pedagogy is to bring language minority families into the American mold, to teach them our national language, to help them wash out as quickly as possible old country ways and old country languages and substitute a new way of life for the old, and to help orient newcomers to the "here" and away from the "there." Stated otherwise, the plan is to help resocialize by replacing or substituting a former way of life with a new alternative. Replacement means subtracting out an older, potentially dysfunctional cultural background in order to become comfortable with the required new culture. If parents can't swing this resocialization themselves, then their responsibility should be to provide support so that their children can make the transformation.

The aim of the FL advocate, in contrast, is to civilize and refine the American character by introducing American young people to the older centers of civilization and to the writers who concretize through their languages the greatness of these civilizations, ancient or contemporary. The aim is also to prepare American young people to be sojourners, tourists, or visitors themselves so as to be enriched through hands-on experiences. Moreover, FL training should prepare students to be the links or communicators with the young living in foreign places, making them the potential mediators between cultures, the collaborators in international affairs. In other words, the FL approach aims to add refinement and international class to the down-to-earth, eminently practical American character.

Contrasts in the Impact on the Recipients of SL versus FL Education

The messages received by SL users are slowly but surely decoded. Language minorities are told indirectly to accommodate and assimilate to the host culture, linguistically first and, in the process, culturally as well. Mastering English is presented as a necessity in order to survive, compete, and possibly even succeed in the new land. The young ones are asked to reprogram themselves in terms of basic language-thought relationships, replacing earlier formed word-thought connections with new ones. They are also asked to become American as quickly as possible by distancing themselves from old country ways of thinking and behaving.

Newcomers are led to believe that accommodation will be easier if they demonstrate, through cultural and linguistic gestures, that they want to become fully American. In this way, they can win new friends among Americans. Once accommodated, they can appreciate the new way of life offered, and this will eventually compensate for nostalgic thinking about the loss of an old way of life.

The messages sent to FL users are less subtle and more easily decoded. They are led to believe that they can enhance their personal worth and power through knowledge and experience of a foreign culture and language, that the comparative linguistic strength they might develop could amplify their knowledge of and skill with their mother tongue, that their personal enrichment through the classics would certainly double their cocktail party charm, and that they could capitalize on an informed internationalism fostered through FL experiences because the corporate/business world needs such people, the media fields would appreciate such training, and the executive world would more likely let one in because of it.

Real World Realities of SL and FL Education

How relevant to today's world are these simple characterizations of these two contrasting forms of education? The SL suppliers are still prominent and active and have been, in my experience, since World War II. Shortly after the war, the Eisenhower administration instituted the National Defense Education Act, which challenged language specialists to improve foreign language teaching because America was found to be tongue-tied on foreign languages, relative to other nations. The challenge fell first to FL specialists, but the responsibility slipped from them to SL experts and to applied linguists who wanted quantifiable signs of improvement, not in the classics but in communicative skills in modern FLs. Applied linguists and educational psychologists became the specialists of modern FL teaching/learning; they were the ones who would evaluate the output of one teaching approach versus another. These specialists, later joined by TESL experts, were available, experienced, and ready to help with SL problems, especially with the problems of language minority children who became increasingly numerous in public school systems across the nation.

In today's world, the SL specialists are still young and enthusiastic and even more broadly trained in the technical aspects of language teaching/learning. Although the training of new SL specialists today includes high level competence in one or more foreign languages and in the related social histories and classics of the cultures involved, it is my observation that new SL recruits are still drawn from the language-linguistics division of university language deparatments, not from the language-literature division, and their training is typically slanted toward linguistic and psycholinguistic studies, TESOL, and educational psychology. Thus, my feeling is that the technical prominence of SL practitioners in the field of language education still leaves most old-line FL specialists on the sidelines, essentially out of the main action.

There is nothing new about this division of specialties. In the 1960s and 70s we witnessed the demise of foreign lanaguage requirements at the college/university level, and then,in apparent response, at the high school level as well (see Parker, 1967). The purpose and value of foreign languages was questioned. With the world-wide adoption of English as the number one international language, need English speakers learn other languages? Many colleges accepted a course or two in computer science, for example, as a fair, more useful, alternative to FL training. It was also becoming true that Americans could now leave home and visit Florence, Paris, or wherever and find plenty of locals surprisingly skilled in English. In the process, of course, we were becoming "ugly Americans" (Lederer & Burdick, 1958) in the sense that we were presumptuous about the sufficiency of English; we would even flaunt our ignorance of foreign languages and cultures. We were simultaneously becoming pushovers on the international scene in the sense that we depended on local

hired hands in foreign sites to tell us their versions of what the foreign press or letters to the editors were saying about us Americans; Iranian bilinguals could explain to a whole embassy staff of Americans in Teheran (few if any of whom were skilled in Farsi) why they were being held as hostages and what their fate might be; Japanese and European car makers could come to the United States and learn the ways of our auto industry and tell Americans only as much as they needed to be told about how their auto industries were shaping up in Japan or Germany.

Recent awakenings of interest in FL education seem to me to derive in part from America's decline in the international fields of diplomacy, industry, and technology. It is becoming evident that not only will we have to learn other people's languages and visit them at home in order to catch up, but that there is more to it than simply learning communicative skills in their languages. Perhaps the mysteries of old world values, cultures, and points of view will have to be reconsidered? Even so, American parents, basically dissatisfied with their own experiences of two to three years of high school or college FL education, may still wonder about their children's possibilities of ever catching up.

Parents' Desires and Expectations for their Children's SL and FL Education

Whether parents' expectations can be met or not, SL or FL specialists have very little information about what American parents — whether minority language or mainstream anglophones —actually think about SL and FL education for their children or how such education might be related to the more basic issue of trying to cope with language and cultural diversity in the United States, an issue as relevant today as it has ever been in our history.

Let me draw on a survey that two of us at McGill (Lambert & Taylor, 1988; 1990) are conducting in order get some idea of parents' views on just these issues. The research in question focuses on a fundamental and long-standing debate in America about how immigrants and established ethnic minority groups can and should accommodate to mainstream society and be accommodated by it. In this debate, two contrasting ideological positions are highlighted: **assimilation**, the belief that cultural minorities should give up their so-called "heritage" cultures and take on the "American" way of life, and **multiculturalism**, the view that
these groups should maintain their heritage cultures as much as possible.

This debate has had a rich theoretical and empirical history in the sociology of ethnic relations (see Hirschman, 1983). The assimilation perspective (e.g., Park and Burgess, 1921; Gordon, 1964) was and, according to some, "continues to be the primary theoretical framework" (Hirschman, 1983;401). More recently, the assimilation view has been challenged by those who perceive

over the past two decades a revival of ethnicity (e.g., Glazer and Moynihan, 1970; Greely, 1974; Novak, 1972). The ethnic revival perspective, while gaining momentum, has itself been challenged by others (e.g., Alba, 1981; Gans, 1979), who question the depth of the alleged resurgence of ethnic awareness.

In order to gauge contemporary thinking on these issues and especially the role that attitudes play, we chose to conduct our first study in a large American metropolitan area which, like many others in the United States, is continually accommodating to the social pressures generated by daily contacts among members of a large array of ethnic groups, some visible "minorities", and others hardly visible at all. Urban centers and inner city public schools in the United States are unmistakably diverse in cultural and racial composition. Thus, the underlying concern of our study is how communities and schools adjust to the social tensions that inevitably arise among members of such a variety of ethnic and racial groups.

We focused on parents whose children were attending public schools in this urban setting. In probing their views on assimilation and multiculturalism, we took care to present both the favorable and unfavorable arguments commonly associated with each alternative. For instance, respondents who favored assimilation as a general policy were then asked if this option would actually promote national unity and also if in the process the nation might lose the best that other cultural groups had to offer. Similarly, respondents who favored multiculturalism were asked if this would dangerously diversify the nation and increase language barriers, and also if this would permit newcomers to keep their identity, generate intergroup tolerance, and conserve each group's distinctive contributions.

Three overriding issues were addressed: attitudes about assimilation versus the maintenance of heritage culture (multiculturalism); views about the maintenance and use of heritage languages (bilingualism); attitudes toward each respondent's own group and toward other prominent ethnic groups in the community (the issue of intergroup harmony or conflict).

The participants in the study were all parents of children enrolled in public schools in either Hamtramck or Pontiac, two ethnically diverse communities adjacent to Detroit, Michigan. The participants were chosen because they belonged to one of the four major ethnic groups living in Hamtramck: Polish Americans, Arab Americans, Albanian Americans, black Americans; or one of the five major ethnic groups living in Pontiac: Mexican Americans, Puerto Rican Americans, black Americans, working class white Americans, or middle class white Americans. According to plan, all groups but one comprised respondents from lower working class backgrounds; the exception was the middle class whites who were included as an important reference group. A

distinctive demographic feature of the
whites are, in large proportion, famil
motor industries for generations and
southern states.

We selected from the literatu
and values that seemed appropriate fo
focused on particular combinations
The final interview schedule was pro
Albanian, and Spanish and tested aga
groups. Because some parents might
decided that the interviewers would
would give their responses in term
accompanied each item. Thus every
point scale defined at one end (1) by
totally" and at the other (7) with "extr
the midpoint on each scale. Althoug
interpersonal, the respondents were
sion of questions designed so that sy
carried out on their responses.

Two to four interviewers
community on the basis of recognize
teachers, social workers, nurses, fo
bilinguals in a heritage language an
English speaking mainstream Americ
the respondents which meant that a
their family backgrounds were typica
of the respondents.

Polish, Arab, and Albanian Americ

One of the main questions
cultural and racial groups — immigr
give up their traditional ways of life i
or should they maintain their herit
respondents' positions on this deba
questions probed the implications o

Despite a host of minor and
and outlook, there is a surprising degr
among all the key ethnic groups in H
tal issues. Polish, Arab, and Albanian
committed to the idea of multicultur
a viable strategy for newcomers to A

greater Detroit area is tha working class
ies from the South who have been in the
who keep close ties with relatives in the

re certain standard measures of attitudes
r our purposes and developed others that
f feelings, attitudes, and points of view.
fessionally translated into Arabic, Polish,
n with small samples of each of our target
ave had trouble reading questions, it was
read questions aloud and that parents
s of Likert-type numerical scales that
question required a response on a seven-
such qualifiers as "not at all" or "disagree
emely" or "agree totally"; (4) represented
h the interviews were kept informal and
taken through a predetermined progres-
stematic psychometric analyses could be

ere selected from within each ethnic
d respectability. Thus the majority were
example. All interviewers were fluent
d English, except for those interviewing
ans. They were in all cases coethnics with
lthough they held responsible positions,
l of the working class family backgrounds

ans

all respondents were asked was: Should
ant minorities or long-term minorities —
n order to assimilate to American society,
ge cultures as much as possible? Once
te were indicated, a series of follow-up
the general stance taken.

sometimes major differences in attitude
ee of consensus and agreement within and
amtramck concerning certain fundamen-
Americans in our sample were all strongly
alism, and they all rejected assimilation as
merica. The Polish parents, while not as

extreme as the Arab and Albanian parents, nevertheless showed a clear endorsement of multiculturalism, which is especially strong considering that many of this group are third generation in the United States. The extent of the position taken by these and all other ethnic groups surveyed is depicted graphically in Figure 1.

Parents from all three groups also believed that being bilingual in both the heritage language and English would be a great advantage for their children. The advantages they saw were not limited to feelings of ethnic identity and family solidarity but extended to the world of work. The degree of their support for bilingualism is presented graphically in Figure 2.

These two figures help to portray one of our major conclusions, namely that these samples of ethnic parents want opportunities for themselves and their children to juggle two cultures, that is, to become bicultural and bilingual Americans rather than to give up heritage cultures and languages in order to become "American." In short, their responses suggest that they want members of their families to become "double breeds" rather than single breeds or, possibly, half-breeds.

Puerto Rican and Mexican Americans

The parents representing the two Hispanic groups in Pontiac — Puerto Rican and Mexican Americans — strongly endorse multiculturalism (see Figure 1). Puerto Rican parents are especially committed to maintaining their heritage culture and language. Both samples of Hispanic parents are also as favorable toward bilingualism as were the ethnic groups in Hamtramck. Both Puerto Rican and Mexican respondents feel that their children will benefit in terms of their social identity and in the practical world of work by being fluent in both Spanish and English.

Puerto Rican American parents take a particularly strong stance on the role public schools should play in promoting bilingualism. While Mexican American parents want their children to be bilingual, they feel that community-based language classes might be an appropriate context for maintaining the heritage language. Puerto Rican American parents, however, believe that public schools have a responsibility to promote both Spanish and English for their children.

White Middle and Working Class Americans

How do our samples of white Americans feel about multiculturalism and assimilation? Do their perspectives on these issues clash with those of ethnic newcomers? The research suggests two quite different answers to these questions, one for middle class whites and a second for working class whites.

Middle class white parents revealed a surprisingly favorable perspective on multiculturalism, one that suggests an appreciation for the adjustment pressures experienced by ethnic newcomers and black Americans alike. They have favorable attitudes toward each of the ethnic groups, including blacks, in the community; they assign each group positive personal attributes; and they express willingness to interact with other groups at all levels of social distance. They also support the idea of keeping heritage cultures and languages alive in the home and community but draw the line at having public schools use languages other than English in the instruction of language minority children. For their own children, however, they prize bilingualism, even when developed through schooling, for its social, intellectual, and career-related consequences. We interpreted this comparatively strong support of multiculturalism and this personal appreciation of ethnic newcomers as a derivative of the favorable self-view the middle class white parents displayed, including the feeling of security they have in their social position.

At the same time, white working class parents displayed a quite different, essentially hostile attitude not only toward multiculturalism but also toward ethnic newcomers and minorities. Because the white working class sample was comprised mainly of people who had come to Detroit from various southern states, keeping family and residential contacts in both places and moving from one site to another depending on available work, we can in no sense generalize these results to other working class white Americans. This particular group, however, with its own distinctively southern American cultural heritage, takes a neutral stand on the debate about multiculturalism versus cultural assimilation. Other than this neutrality, their attitudes toward all other ethnic groups in the community are negative and stereotyped to the point of being disdainful. They attribute no favorable characteristics to any group other than white Americans, and they are inclined to keep all other groups at extreme social distances, ethnic newcomers as well as blacks. This generally negative attitude shows itself as well in their manner of questioning why ethnic newcomers should want to keep heritage cultures and languages alive and in the strong stand they take against culture and language training, other than "American," in the public schools. They do, though, see substantial advantages for their own children were they to become bilingual.

In sum, then, what we found in this urban community is that the more established, mainstream white parents fall into two strikingly different groups in terms of attitudes. The white middle class group emerges as supportive of multiculturalism, whereas the white working class group appears suspicious, unfriendly, and potentially threatened by cultural and racial diversity. This clear contrast in the attitudes of two subgroups of white Americans may pose difficulties for both ethnic newcomers and long-term minorities as they try to adjust to the American scene: If they were to generalize about white mainstream

Americans through experiences with one social-class group only, they would likely be misled.

Black Americans

What about black Americans' perspectives on multiculturalism, multilingualism, and public education? Are they consonant or dissonant with those of other ethnic minority groups and with those of mainstream white Americans? Since we surveyed separate samples of black parents in Hamtramck and Pontiac, we have a relatively broad base for drawing the following conclusions. In Figure 1, the average of the two samples is depicted.

It became clear that black American parents are generally favorable toward multiculturalism and generally against assimilation. Their attitudes toward other ethnic groups are most similar to those of the socially dominant group in the community. Thus in Hamtramck, their attitude profile approaches that of Polish Americans and in Pontiac to that of middle class whites. In both sites, black parents give consistent arguments to bolster their stand, as, for example, that pressures to assimilate would perturb the identities of ethnic minorities and that the nation would lose the best that each ethnic group has to offer.

On the issue of heritage language maintenance, black parents would like their own children to develop full bidialectual skills involving black English and standard American English, but an overemphasis on black English is mistakenly seen as dysfunctional and inappropriate. The generality of their position is seen in the strong endorsement they give to other minority groups' attempts to keep their heritage languages alive. They feel that these other languages should be kept up at home and in the community, but they are hesitant about having ethnic languages used in the public schools. Thus they argue that heritage cultures should be sustained in public schools much more than heritage languages. This position brings the blacks in line with Polish American parents in Hamtramck and away from the Arabs and Albanians, and in Pontiac, it makes them very similar to middle class whites and different from the Hispanics.

In general, blacks hold basically favorable views of other ethnic groups, and they rate themselves similarly. They recognize that certain other ethnic groups are somewhat favorable towards blacks (e.g., the Polish Americans and the middle-class whites), and in these instances they contribute to a mutuality of respect and appreciation.

This similarity of perspectives of black and middle class whites in our study parallels closely the findings of Lorand Szalay, who discovered that the "psychocultural distance between black and white Americans was relatively

narrow, compared with the distance between Latin American immigrants and both groups" (Cunningham, 1984). Our work, however, reveals striking differences between socioeconomic subgroups of white Americans.

Black parents thus present themselves as supporters of multiculturalism, as a group that is sympathetic to other ethnic minorities, as a people who have their own valued culture and language style to preserve, and as coshapers and cocontributors to the "American way of life."

In summary, this community-based study, planned as an up-to-date pulse-taking of urban Americans' attitudes toward multiculturalism versus cultural assimilation, found: (1) a strong cross-subgroup support for culture and language maintenance not only from working class subgroups of ethnolinguistic minority groups but also from working class blacks and middle class whites; (2) support for multiculturalism even from certain subgroups who have resided in the United States for over twenty-five years (e.g., Polish and Mexican Americans); (3) widespread support for bilingualism, which is seen as a means of enhancing economic and career advancement; (4) endorsement from all ethnolinguistic immigrant groups for public school involvement in teaching about heritage cultures, with support also from two long-term resident groups, the blacks and middle class whites; (5) diversity on the idea that public schools might use heritage languages for instruction, some groups favorable (e.g., the Arabs, the Albanians, and the Hispanics) and others (the Polish, blacks, and the middle class whites) with reservations; and (6) one group, the working class whites, distinctly out of line with all others because of attitudes and values that are negative toward multiculturalism and basically racist in makeup.

Going into the community in this fashion makes us question whether the purposes and aims of SL and FL specialists, as schematized earlier, are adequate and sensitive to social realities. The same survey is currently underway in Miami, Florida with new subgroups: Cuban Americans, Nicaraguan Americans, and Haitian Americans as well as mainstream blacks and whites (Taylor & Lambert, in progress). The same general patterns of outcomes are apparent, suggesting that parents of these language minority groups also favor multiculturalism over assimilation, bilingualism over a forced English only alternative, and a desire to become bicultural rather than forfeiting a heritage culture in the process of becoming Americanized. These parents seem to say that they want their children to be as American as anyone else, and that, given half a chance, they will be able to juggle American and heritage cultures with no great difficulty and that the nation will be enriched in the process.

Implications of These Community Surveys

What these community surveys suggest to me is that the aims and purposes of SL and FL education need to be realigned so that, through collaboration, the best of each form can be jointly focused on improving the learning experiences of both SL and FL users. The changes I have in mind are something more than merely expanding the role of SL specialists, for it is unlikely, because of their training, that they will be able to deal adequately with the variety of social and cultural factors involved in either form of education. They cannot do it alone, but they could in conjunction with FL specialists. For instance, Wong (1987) presents a constructive critique of the inadequacies of the SL approach on its own when directed at the issue of language education for Asian immigrant and refugee youngsters in America. This suggests to me that the expertise of FL specialists could be capitalized on by SL specialists so that important and socially relevant issues such as the contrasts and similarities of cultures and values can be integrated into either SL or FL programs.

At the same time, FL specialists need to expand their interests from tight preoccupation with the classics to include the modern contemporary world of foreign languages and cultures. Let me give three examples of what I have in mind, illustrated by the work of Howard Nostrand (1974), Lawrence Wylie (1957; 1966), and Eleanor Jorden (1990). All three started their careers as FL practitioners, but each broke away from conventional FL teaching by probing various aspects of culture and human interaction in contemporary foreign societies. Each also made collaborative contacts with SL specialists and other behavioral scientists.

Nostrand collaborated extensively with sociologists, anthropologists, and classical FL specialists in order to map out a network of societal values and distinctive cultural orientations of a complex society like France that have held up over centuries. His work represents some of the best cross-cultural psychoanthropology I have ever encountered, and his FL courses on French people and their language were some of the best ever produced. Similarly, Lawrence Wylie became more than a conventional FL specialist when he took a year's leave to live among French people and study them and their cultural ways. His Village in the Vaucluse and a follow-up study of a second community, entitled Chanzeaux, are not only wonderful cross-cultural investigations but fascinating introductions for American students to French people and their language.

Eleanor Jorden (1990) realized, as an FL specialist in Japanese, that FL and the significance of interpersonal communication in the Japanese society were so interlocked that a detailed, fine-textured analysis of the cultural meanings of messages had to be worked out in order to teach the language properly. The realistic planning of her video program of episodes of interper-

sonal interactions allows students to learn concepts in Japanese as well as the sociocultural significance of what is said or not said and how and why each participant behaves as he/she does. Joint efforts of this sort can make real changes in language education for both SL and FL users.

Two Basic Restraints on Attempts to Improve SL/FL Education

I see two fundamental restrictions, however, that have to be understood and dealt with by those interested in making changes. The first is a no-nonsense demand on the part of users that more be supplied in SL and FL education than has been the case. The second restraint is time, that is, how suppliers can optimize the time spent on SL or FL education. Once these requirements are taken into consideration, various new suggestions for improving SL/FL education come to mind.

Demands for Higher Levels of Achievement in SLs or FLs

In today's world, parents, and through them children as well, are disenchanted with what language training programs have traditionally been able to do in developing useful, effective SL or foreign language skills. Conventional three-year high school programs in a FL, or a college equivalent, rarely instill useful skills. Even with pessimistic expectations, however, parents and students nowadays still want more and feel they need more than they are likely to get from traditional SL or FL offerings. This increased demand for more stems, I believe, from various sources of pressure. For example, the world of work is calling for applicants with high level bilingual/bicultural competence. Furthermore, linguistic minority groups in urban centers are becoming large enough and bilingual enough to shut mainstream white and black American workers out of competition for valuable jobs because they do not have bilingual/bicultural skills. For example, Cuban Americans in Dade County, Florida, Korean Americans in sections of New York, and Iranian Americans in other sections of Los Angeles are now in power positions where they decide who will be hired. This often means that blacks in Miami need high-level communicative skills in Spanish if they do not want to lose their work possibilities, starting with the taxi business. Similarly, white anglophones can be locked out of the banking business if they can't function in Spanish. It also means, of course, that Cubans, Koreans, and Iranians can be locked into a limited ethnic network of opportunities if they don't master English (see Chira, 1990, for an example of Korean American power in New York City).

For a small subgroup of Americans, demands for greater competence in foreign languages or second languages are on the increase, I believe, because this minority at least realizes that multiculturalism in the nation will only work if all ethnolinguistic groups are open to and considerate of ethnic differences.

These more perceptive citizens realize that exaggerated forms of ethnocentrism develop when ethnic groups are isolated or ignored and that ethnocentrism engenders xenophobia and other aspects of intergroup distrust. A possible solution, they would argue, would be to encourage a widespread program of learning one another's languages as a means of fostering ethnic group appreciation and societal peace.

Regardless of the motivations, it is safe to assume that the users of both FL and SL education expect and want more than has traditionally been delivered by FL/SL suppliers and that suggestions for changes in these professions must incorporate this strong desire for more. What is really wanted, I believe, is a functional bilinguality in the mother tongue and another language, whether people realize this or not.

Time as a Determining Factor in Raising SL/FL Achievement Levels

Time enters into all formulas aimed at enhancing language achievement skills. To devote more curriculum time to learning languages means less time for the development of other very necessary skills. Time available for languages can be stretched out if SL/FL training is pushed back to early school years, and SL specialists can determine, through evaluative research, when the best starting time might be. But devoting more time to languages may shortchange the mainstream child in the development of math and science skills, and in the case of the minority child given extra time in English, shortchange him/her because the heritage language is neglected along with math and science.

Others in the fields of SL/FL focus on filling time better by improving the format of SL/FL programs. Here the SL specialists are making clearly valuable contributions. For instance, Tucker (1990) and Crandall and Tucker (1989) have documented the value of emphasizing content-based SL/FL teaching over language focused teaching; of introducing languages through the media of problem-solving exercises, through the use of decontextualized presentations and through cooperative learning approaches. Others (Swain, 1990; Lindholm, 1990c) have shown that language education programs save time and enhance achievement levels, particularly when attention is directed to developing reading and writing skills in the SL/FL as early and as fully as possible. Doing so appears to root better the new language and thus progress is augmented.

Still others attempt to use time more profitably by providing instruction of academic content through the medium of the new language being taught/learned. The promise in this case is that both content matters and the target language can be processed in parallel and both can be acquired efficiently within a common time frame. This incidental acquisition of language while

learning content matters — two forms of learning transpiring simultaneously — is a distinctive feature of language immersion programs (Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Genesee, 1987). These can take various forms: early immersion, delayed or late immersion, total or partial immersion, double immersion (e.g., Jewish youngsters in Montreal who have only English as a home language are taught half-time through Hebrew and half-time through French for most of the elementary school years), or two-way bilingual immersion (e.g., in the United States, classes comprised 50/50 of anglophone and Hispanic children are instructed half day by an English speaking teacher and half-day by a Spanish-speaking teacher).

In the suggestions for changes in SL/FL education that follow, many of these attempts to optimize the time and effort spent on language learning emerge as important components of a possible plan for improving language training, a plan that relies on the collaboration of SL and FL specialists.

A Plan for Improving SL and FL Education

When policy decisions are made about education for language minority children, it is inappropriate, in my way of thinking, to let language considerations play the dominant role, even in the case where the language minority youngster has a home language different from that of the school and of the host nation. Rather than emphasizing language, the educational offerings — the basic content matters of schooling — have to be kept clearly in the center of focus, and what is taught needs be deep and comprehensive because the children and families involved have enough problems of coping, belonging and succeeding in a new land without being shortchanged with a superficial or nonrelevant program of education. With attention focused squarely on providing a comprehensive, better-than-average, education for language minority students, policy makers only then are in a position to think profitably about language issues, e.g., the psychological realities of language — that languages are always intimately linked with people's identities and social skills and with their feelings of security and confidence; and the social realities of language — that language programs have serious implications not only for a particular target group but also for all other groups who share the same social environment and who interact with those in the target group — for example, black Americans who can easily feel neglected and threatened by remedies aimed at language minorities. The needs of blacks, therefore, need to be included in any really useful plan from the start (see Lambert and Taylor, 1987; 1990).

A New and Promising Form of Two-Language Education for Both SL and FL Users

Ironically, the complex issue of helping language minority children become educated and accommodated to American society is no longer an overwhelming problem for many of us in the specialized field of language education. This is so because there is now persuasive research information available on how language minority children can become both well educated and comfortably Americanized at the same time as English-speaking American mainstreamers can become skilled in a foreign language.

In reviewing the highlights of this research evidence, I will draw on Canadian experiences that led to much of the early experimentation. Canadian experiences may also help American readers get some perspective on their own problems since Canada, like the United States, is struggling to make its society fairer not only for Canada's two "founding peoples"—the French-speaking and the English speaking — but also for numerous other language minority groups comprising the "Canadian mosaic." These examples are pertinent to American society because similar social processes are clearly at play in both settings. They are more visible in Canada because of sociopolitical pressure from French speaking Canadians in Quebec for linguistic, cultural, and political independence from the rest of the country (see Esman, 1987; Lambert, 1988).

Although there are numerous Canadian/American parallels to draw on, there are still important differences. For instance, Canada's constitution has clear provisions for the protection of the language and culture of both French and English speaking subgroups, and although the government has a policy favoring multiculturalism, it does not provide extended financial support for education conducted in any of the numerous other home languages spoken in Canada. Since World War II, immigrants with languages other than English or French make up a sizable proportion of Canada's population. To its great credit, the United States has federal laws requiring education help — including assistance from bilingual teachers and aides — for all non-English-speaking ethnic groups who might be placed at a disadvantage in schools conducted in English only. On the other hand, the United States shows no signs of recognizing or appreciating the de facto bilingual character of the nation as a whole, which now has nearly as many people with Spanish as the home language as there are people in the total population of Canada. And the English/Spanish bilingual character of contemporary America is only one strain since there are various other equally vital ethnolinguistic groups, each contributing to a fascinating multiculturalism in the American society. Thus, both America and Canada have much more to do in their attempts to cope with multiculturalism (see Lambert and Taylor, 1990).

French-speaking Canadians have had a long history of finding themselves second class citizens in a social world which has reinforced Anglo-American values and the English language. The second class status manifested itself in the form of French speaking Canadians playing subordinate roles to English Canadians, the dominant subgroup in Canadian society, comparable to the English-speaking white mainstreamer in the United States. Not only have French Canadians been grossly underrepresented in the upper levels of Canada-wide status hierarchies, but even in the Province of Quebec, where they constitute some eighty percent of the population, French Canadians have not, relative to English Canadians, made it occupationally or economically, and their style of life has been ignored, ridiculed, and blamed as the cause of their social and economic position. The trouble is that this type of thinking becomes contagious, and, over time, even members of the marked minority group begin to believe they are inferior in some sense and blame themselves for their inferiority. It takes much reflection in frustrating situations of this sort to see through the sophistry and realize that one's ethnic or social class group is in no way inherently inferior, but simply that those with the power advantages have learned well how to keep the advantages and that their social class cushion makes keeping power relatively easy for them. Stereotyping or otherwise marking minority groups — people they really know very little about — becomes an effective way for the majority group to keep others out of the power sphere.

As social psychologists, several of us at McGill University began to study this state of affairs in Canada some thirty years ago just as two extreme solutions to the "French Canadian problem" were coming into vogue: 1) French Canadians should pull up their socks and compete — meaning they should master English and Anglo-American ways while toning down their French Canadianness; 2) French Canadians should pull apart or separate — meaning they should form a new independent nation where they could be masters of their own fate and where the French Canadian language and culture could be protected. Both alternatives worried us because one meant giving up a style of life that was precious, and the other meant closing a society through separation, "closing" in the sense that Karl Popper (1966) uses the term in describing sociopolitical attempts to create a conflict-free subworld where the "good old ways" will be protected. Instead we viewed the French Canadian way of life as something valuable for Canada as a whole — a nation whose potential and fascination rest in its multiculturalism/multilingual makeup, whether or not it was appreciated as such by the majority of English or French Canadians.

So we became interested in reducing if possible the ignorance of French Canadianness and in enhancing an appreciation for it among Anglo-American children, and this became the guiding purpose for the research initiated at McGill on "early immersion" schooling (Lambert and Tucker, 1972). In immersion classes, English speaking children, with no French

language experience in their homes and little if any in their communities, enter public school kindergarten or grade 1 classes that are conducted by a monolingual French speaking teacher. This "early immersion" or "home-to-school-language-switch" program, as we call it, is kept exclusively French through grade two and only at grade two or three is English introduced, in the form of a language arts program, for one period a day. By grade four particular subject matters are taught in English (by a separate English speaking teacher) so that by grades five and six some 60 percent of instruction is in English.

Note the special features of this innovation. English- speaking mainstream Canadian children were introduced from the start of schooling to a language that was as "foreign" to most of them as German or Greek would have been, even though French and English are the nation's two official languages. The teachers were thus FL specialists even though their main training was as elementary school teachers functioning in their native language. The program provided an opportunity for collaborating among FL and SL specialists, with the involvement of social psychologists and educationists.

The concept of immersion schooling was based on a simple premise; that people learn a foreign or second language in much the same way as they learn their first, and that languages are best learned in contexts where the person is socially stimulated to acquire the language and is exposed to it in its natural form.

The consistent findings from nearly twenty-five years of longitudinal research on children in immersion programs permit several conclusions which bear not only on the linguistic consequences of the programs but the psychological and social consequences as well: 1) Immersion pupils are taken along by: monolingual teachers to a level of functional bilingualism that could not be duplicated in any other fashion short of living and being schooled in a foreign setting. 2) Pupils arrive at that level of competence without detriment to home language skill development. 3) Pupils do not fall behind in the all important content areas of the curriculum, indicating that the incidental acquisition of French does not distract the students from learning new and complex ideas through French. 4) Immersion pupils do not experience any form of mental confusion or loss of normal cognitive growth. 5) They do not experience a loss of identity or appreciation for their own ethnic background. 6) Most important of all in the present context, they also become informed about and develop a deeper appreciation for French Canadians by having learned about them and their culture through their teachers, through their developing skill with the language, and through familiarity with the literature and values of French Canadians (see Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Swain, 1974; Cummins, 1986; Genesee, 1987).

What is exciting about this program, over and above its educational and cognitive impact, is that it opens children's minds to an otherwise foreign and possibly threatening outgroup. It also provides them with sociopolitical insights that monolingual mainstreamers rarely develop. For example, the immersion children come to the realization that peaceful democratic coexistence among members of distinctive ethnolinguistic groups calls for something more than simply learning one another's languages (Blake, Lambert, Sidoti, Wolfe, 1981; Cziko, Lambert, Sidoti, & Tucker, 1980). Having learned the other language well and having learned to appreciate the other cultural group, children with immersion experience, compared to controls, realize that effective and peaceful coexistence calls for something even more important — opportunities for both ethnic groups of young people to interact socially on an equitable basis. This is a very sophisticated insight that most adults never attain.

Thus, a new approach to the development of two-language skills is now available, and since it works as well in other parts of Canada, where few if any French Canadians are encountered in social life (Swain, 1974; 1990), this approach, or some variation of it, can be expected to work equally well in the United States as preliminary studies show (see Genesee, 1987).

By focusing on subject matter mastery and on making language learning incidental, immersion programs differ substantively from SL teaching programs (e.g., French-as-a-second-language programs), in which subject matter mastery is not a main goal, in which the focus is placed on the second language, and in which very little time is actually devoted to the second language. The SL component also becomes the responsibility of a specialist rather than the classroom teacher. Thus, immersion programs are much more intense and comprehensive than SL programs; and since no specialists are involved, the cost of immersion programs is hardly any different from normal costs since the classroom teacher is also the language specialist, and the class size (e.g., thirty to thirty-two pupils to a teacher in Canada) is kept normal. There are no paid native speaker teacher aides in immersion classes.

Immersion education differs from typical bilingual education programs as conducted in North America. No bilingual skills are required of the teacher who plays the role of a monolingual in the target language, never switching languages, reviewing materials in their other language, or otherwise using the second language. Instead, two-language competence is developed through two separate monolingual instructional routes.

There is actually a large number of communities in some twenty states of the United States where comparable early immersion programs, either total or partial, for mainstream English-speaking children are underway, and these involve not only the popular languages but also the less popular, e.g. Arabic, Russian, Dutch, Japanese, Cantonese, Hawaiian, etc. From all available

accounts, they are working splendidly. Part of the reason for their success is that school administrators and principals, after an initial period of skepticism and wariness, become extremely pleased with the outcomes. Furthermore, the costs of the programs are surprisingly low, compared to second-language-teaching programs, because the regular teachers' salaries simply go to the new "foreign speaking" teachers.

But what counts most as success is the pride of progress reflected by teachers, parents, and pupils. For example, Frank Grittner, the supervisor of Second Language Education for the State of Wisconsin, has collected data on third grade English- speaking children (few with German ethnic backgrounds) in a German immersion program in which they were taught through German for three years (Grittner, 1985). That particular immersion program was part of a plan for desegregation and thus some 40 percent of the pupils involved were black. At the end of grade three, 100 percent of the German immersion pupils scored in the average to above average range on the Metropolitan Achievement Test for Reading (in English) compared to 70 percent for Milwaukee schools in general and 77 percent for United States norm groups. Likewise on the mathematics test (also tested through English) the respective average scores were 92, 71, and 77 percent. Similar outcomes are available for English speaking American children in a French immersion program in Holliston, Massachusetts; in Montgomery County Public Schools in Maryland; and in the Cincinnati, Ohio Public Schools (see Genesee, Holobow, & Lambert, 1990; Holobow, Genesee, & Lambert, 1990), as examples among many others.

Furthermore, there is strong evidence to show that monolingual English speaking Canadian children can handle easily a "double immersion" program. For example, French and Hebrew are used in separate streams as the languages of instruction for English-speaking Jewish youngsters in Montreal (Genesee & Lambert, 1983). In another example, Mohawk and English are the instructional languages for Mohawk students in reservation schools outside Montreal (Holobow, Lambert, Genesee, 1990). The success of double immersion programs, incidentally, should give second thoughts to Canadian policy makers who are more prone to promote multiculturalism vocally than they are to provide means for at least some instruction via heritage languages. The point is that ethnic minorities in Canada might easily handle and profit from education that is trilingual — French, English, and heritage language.

The double immersion option may well become increasingly relevant in U.S. language education as particular ethnolinguistic minority groups increase in size through secondary migration movements. For instance, many Asian immigrant groups (e.g., Vietnamese, Laotians, Indians, Koreans) want and need English language skills along with heritage language maintenance, but they often find that their growing ethnic community is contiguous with an already large Hispanic community, as is the case in urban centers in Florida,

New York, Illinois, California, making
tional necessity. Thus, one can easily ir
the double immersion option in the Unit
English and Spanish (or some other wide
for in public and/or community-based

skill in Spanish a social and occupa-
nagine an increase in the relevance of
ted States wherein a heritage language,
ly used "other" language) are provided
schoolings.

Psychological Implications of Immersi

on Programs

What this review indicates is th
means of developing a functionally bi
United States for those seriously interes
functional bilinguality will vary, dependi
of the immersion experience. The biling
a variant of immersion in which Anglo ch
Lambert et al. 1990). In this case, al
(pronunciation included) were native-like
years of schooling. At the same time, the F
involved were not only as good as but signi
controls who received conventional all-E
documents this striking enhancement of
grade levels in another setting in Canada
that relatively little time is allotted to in
English (the Anglos' home language) in im
level development of English competenc
through transfer, from the high level
mathematics taught through French was
non immersion control students, whether
English or French.

hat there is now available an effective
lingual citizenry in Canada and the
sted in FL education. The degree of
ng on the start time and the intensity
uality can be striking, particularly in
ildren attend all-French schools (see
l aspects of competence in French
e or very close to native after five to six
nglish language skills of the children
ificantly better than those of matched
nglish schooling. Swain (1990) also
English language skills at the upper
What is impressive here is the fact
struction through English or about
mersion education and thus the high
e has to be an enrichment derived,
development of French. Likewise,
also strengthened relative to that of
math competence was tested through

The evidence favoring immersio
reliable. My concern is not that such p
implemented, but rather that they will b
careful consideration given to their psyc
Note first that the lead was taken by t
language development, i.e., the English
mainstreamers, the societal groups mos
linguistic identity. To the extent that main
educated in another language and culture
more equitable society are better. Better t
self-views of ethnolinguistic minority ch
heartened when they realize that mains
gestures to learn about them, their langua

on programs is both consistent and
rograms may not be appreciated or
e too quickly implemented without
chological and social consequences.
hose basically interested in foreign
-speaking Canadian and American
st secure in their own ethnic and
nstream children are sensitized to and
, the chances of developing a fairer,
oo are the chances of improving the
ildren who are complimented and
stream childen are making sincere
ages, and their ways of life.

We have referred to this process of developing bilingual and bicultural skills among English-speaking Canadian or American children as an "additive" form of bilingualism (see Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Lambert, 1974), implying that mainstream anglophone children, with no fear of ethnic/linguistic erosion in Canada or the United States, can add one or more foreign languages to their accumulating skills and profit immensely from the experience — cognitively, socially, and even economically (see Lambert, 1978; Lambert & Taylor, 1990). Most mainstream Anglo parents, once informed about immersion, are immediately aware of these advantages and become very eager to have their children enrolled in immersion programs or variants thereof. They are excited by the possibility that their children will get something more than the traditional foreign language programs that they were offered a generation ago and which failed to develop either language competence or cultural sensitivity.

Two-Language Education from an SL Starting Point

We draw a very sharp contrast between the "additive" form of bilingualism described above and the "subtractive" form, which constitutes a totally different psychological and social reality, has different outcomes, different potential hazards, and different means-to-ends demands. The hyphenated American child, like the French-Canadian child, embarks on a "subtractive" bilingual route as soon as he/she enters a school where a high prestige, socially powerful, dominant language like English is introduced as the exclusive language of instruction. Perceptive members of ethnolinguistic minority groups have good grounds for the worry and concern they express about the steamroller effect of a powerful dominant language; it can, by contrast, make foreign home languages and cultures seem "homely," ghosts in the closet that children would prefer to eradicate and suppress. The effects of this subtractive aspect of bilingualism among francophone university students in Quebec has been studied by Taylor, Meynard, and Rheault (1977), who found that English was seen as a potential threat to their ethnic identity, and thus functioned as a negative motivation in learning English in school. Second, it turned out that those francophones who were least fluent in English were those who felt their cultural identity was most in jeopardy. Just as French is too precious to be subtracted out of Canadian society, so too are the many "foreign" languages and cultures extant in America today too precious to be eradicated from that society.

Even more worrisome at the individual level is the cognitive risk children run when their basic conceptual language — the linguistic system used to form and express thoughts and ideas from infancy on — is abruptly put aside and suppressed so as not to interfere with the new language of the school and of society. They are asked to reprogram themselves, linguisticly and cognitively.

A major responsibility of education policy makers then becomes one of transforming subtractive forms of bilingualism into additive ones for the benefit of the ethnolinguistic minority groups involved. Clearly what the language minority children don't need is immersion or submersion in an exclusively all English program. Too many can't swim in the sink-or-swim option. Community experiments that attempt to implement such transformations, although few in number so far, are now underway. Two experiments with which I have had firsthand experience (see Lambert, 1984) are those with Franco-American youngsters in northern New England (Dub* & Herbert, 1975; Lambert, Giles, & Picard, 1975; Lambert, Giles, & Albert, 1976), and with Mexican American youngsters in San Diego (Herbert, 1986; Lindholm & Fairchild, 1989). Basically these programs call for schooling to be conducted on a part-time basis in the likely-to-be-neglected heritage language of the ethnolinguistic minority child, starting at kindergarten or grade one. The programs continue until it is certain that the home language of the language minority child is strongly rooted and that the children themselves get rooted and oriented as to their ethnic identity. This initial attention to the home language permits them to grasp and keep up with the important content matter, like math and science. The programs, of course, provide a concurrent strand of English language instruction (in the form of ESL or English immersion, taught by a separate teacher) for part of the day, but the dual-track program, involving separate home language and English instruction, is kept up for the first four to five years of primary education. Then, the research findings suggest, a switch to a mainly English language program can more safely take place.

The results of these exploratory attempts to transform subtractive bilingual experiences of language minority children to additive ones are very impressive. For instance, after a five-year trial, the New England Franco-American students in partial French immersion classes outperformed control students in various tests of English language skills and in academic content subjects such as mathematics, studied partly via French. This means that with fifty percent less instruction time alloted to English than the controls following an all-English program, those given half of their instruction through French scored significantly better on tests of English than did the controls. The magic apparent in this finding is that teaching via French had enhanced these students' skills in English. In other words, assisting in the two-language development of these children, had brought them (and not the controls) up to American-wide norms on English and academic content, giving them a better chance to succeed. The control group's scores reflect the academic and social difficulties normally encountered by language minority children undergoing the subtraction of a linguistic and cultural homebase. The magic also involves an amazing transfer of skills from one language to the other and a newly generated sense of pride in being French and in having at home a surprisingly valuable heritage language (Lambert, Giles, & Picard, 1975). But the ethnic

pride was not restricted to having French roots; they had been brought to realize that they were both American and French and that they were happy to be American because the society had provided these simple opportunities for them to be French as well.

The outcomes of the San Diego project are equally exciting because the Hispanic children, who started off as "limited English proficient," were, at the end of grade six "at or above mean percentiles, based on national norms, in reading and mathematics achievement in two languages" (California State Department of Education, 1990, p. 104). They were also performing significantly above peer groups of Hispanic youngsters who had little or no Spanish instruction, i.e., mainly an all- English program. The magic in this case is that these children, capitalizing on the opportunity to develop bilingual skills in the heritage language and English, apparently were able to pull themselves up to national norms and away from the fate of "severe academic under-achievement on measures of reading and writing proficiency" (California State Department of Education, 1990, p. 104) that characterizes Hispanic youngsters who are placed in all-English "submersion" schooling.

Many such programs are now underway in the United States, mainly in the form of late-exit options, a compromise form of "maintenance bilingual" programs wherein language minority children are not exited from two-language instruction programs as soon as they show minimal competence in English (see Ramirez, 1989). In practice, it is no simple matter to get these programs started or to maintain them because language minority parents are easily misled in the belief that there are dangers in having home language instruction in the primary grades (e.g., in Southern California, that speaking Spanish means "wheelbarrow," while speaking English means "fancy auto"; or in northern Maine, that speaking French means woodchopping, while speaking English means getting ahead).

Richard Tucker has evaluated a number of such community-based studies and has come to the conclusion that there is:

> a cumulative and positive impact of bilingual education on all youngsters when they are allowed to remain in bilingual programs for a period of time greater than two or three or even five years and when there is an active attempt to provide nurturance and sustenance of their mother tongue in addition to introducing teaching via the language of wider communication (Tucker, 1980; see also Tucker, 1990).

This reasoning is consistent with Cummins' (1987) findings that the attendant benefits from bilingualism manifest themselves when competencies in both languages are brought up to active, fairly equivalent levels. These levels are best achieved, incidentally, when reading and writing skills in the two languages are fully developed (see Swain, 1990; Lindholm, 1990).

Tucker's conclusion is also consistent with Lindholm's (1990) arguments for patience on the part of educators and parents because both "academic" and "conversational" types of language skill need to be developed in both languages before the full impact of these programs on academic success is manifested (see Lindholm, 1990, pp.20-22).

This, then, is one way that the American society can help develop a new generation of children who could comfortably become both American and Hispanic, Haitian, Polish, Navajo, Arabic, or whatever. But note an essential ingredient of this suggested plan. No time has to be taken from the major task of developing competence in the critical content subjects that make up a solid and demanding educational curriculum. The development of skills in two languages and two cultures need not get in the way of providing a thorough education in science, math, creative language arts, etc. Indeed, language minority youngsters need such an education as much as or more than anyone else, and it is the responsibility of education policy makers to produce a workable curriculum that permits language minority children to actualize their full potential while contributing to a new, ethnically rich society.

Social Implications of Two-Language Programs

It would be naive to assume that members of different ethnolinguistic groups would be interested in learning a second language for the same reasons. The distinction between additive and subtractive bilingualism discussed above points to motivational differences that have important consequences. It would be equally naive to assume that educational programs targeted for one group affect only that group. When a foreign language program is implemented for English-speaking white students, for instance, the effects would certainly be felt among members of the language minority and black communities. If the foreign language introduced were one spoken by a large group of immigrants, it could easily appear to blacks that English-speaking white students were being given preferential access to that community, and more generally, that the whites were in a position to add a skill that could make a powerful group even more powerful. Similarly, giving language minority children special educational attention, like providing them with instruction in their home language as well as English, would have an impact on other groups. It could be perceived that a particular language minority was being given advantages that allow them to become rapidly competitive, thus threatening strategic and well-established power relations and in the United States, hurting blacks in particular. Lambert

and Taylor (1987) outline various strategies to deal specifically with American blacks, the too often neglected group, in matters of education policy making.

Two-Way Immersion Programs: Where FL and SL Education Logically Meet

The variants of immersion programs that might be implemented in the United States are limited only by one's imagination. Some of the precursors to the two-way immersion model are instructive. For example, Susan Thomas (1980) experimented with a "Language to Share" option wherein language minority adolescents (e.g., Italian or Portuguese Americans who, from home, had some conversational skills in a language other than English) were trained to be assistant teachers of their home language to pupils two or three years their junior. To prepare themselves, the real teachers made these junior assistants bone up on the writing/reading and vocabulary skills needed to teach. This became a compact, serious immersion experience for the adolescents which generated enormous interest in the half-forgotten home languages and incidentally in the teaching profession itself. Then there was a plan, never formalized but frequently used informally, for "language exchanges" wherein anglophones interested in learning a particular foreign language are paired up (under the supervision of a master teacher) with another person who has that language as a native language and who would be happy to exchange two or more hours of teaching per week in exchange for similar tutoring in English (see Lambert, 1974).

Then the first Canadian-style immersion program in the United States — the Culver City study (Cohen, 1974)—introduced a small subgroup of native speaking Spanish children into a Spanish immersion class (comprised mainly of anglophone pupils) and monitored the progress of both ethnolinguistic subgroups in both languages. At about the same time, Eunice Lear in San Diego (see Herbert, 1986) formally set up classes with approximately equal numbers of Chicano and Anglo pupils in a two-way program, laying down the paradigm for the current two-way programs.

What, then, is two-way bilingual immersion education? Tucker (1990) gives a clear operational definition:

> Suppose that there are 30 youngsters in a particular grade 1 class at a typical elementary school. Let us assume, for illustrative purposes, that 15 are anglo and 15 are Hispanic. The youngsters would be together in a class in which some portion of the day would be devoted to Spanish language arts (for the Hispanics), Spanish as a

> second language (for the anglos), English language arts (for the anglos), English as a second language (for the Hispanics), with the teaching of selected content material — let us say mathematics — in English, and other content material — let us say history—in Spanish. The idea is to offer a program of bilingual instruction over a several year period in which students from both of the ethnolinguistic groups would have an opportunity to develop and to hone their literacy skills while developing the fullest possible social and academic proficiency in their two languages (Tucker, 1990).

Lindholm (1990b) elaborates and emphasizes the FL and SL features of this form of education:

> Bilingual immersion education combines the most significant features of bilingual education for language minority students and immersion education for language majority students. Academic and language arts instruction is provided to native speakers of two languages using both languages; one of the languages is a second language for each group of students. Thus, for language minority, (i.e., non-English-speaking) students, academic instruction is presented through their first language and they receive English language arts and, depending on the particular program, portions of their academic instruction in English. For language majority (i.e., English-speaking) students, academic instruction is through their second language and they receive English language arts, and, depending on the program design, some portion of their academic instruction in English. The definition encompasses four criterial features: (1) The program essentially involves some form of dual language immersion, where the non-English language is used for at least 50 percent of the students' instructional day; (2) the program involves periods

of instruction durin[g which only one lan-
guage is used; (3) bo[th English speakers and
non-English speaker[s (preferably in balanced
numbers) are partic[ipants; and (4) the stu-
dents are integra[ted for all content
instruction. While[program designs may
vary, most have as [their goal the develop-
ment of true bilingu[al academic competence
in English and anoth[er language on the part
of both groups of [participating students
(Lindholm, 1990b, [pp. 95-96).

This means, then, that over [the elementary years language majority
students (the FL users) receive a full [Spanish immersion program while the
language minority students (the SL u[sers) are made literate and secure in their
heritage language at the same time [that they develop full competence in
English. Students are brought to col[laborate in one another's education, and
FL and SL specialists exchange their e[xperiences as they monitor and orient the
program as teachers and advisors.

There is something elegant a[nd uniquely American about this innova-
tion. In one simple format it offers a [mode of education that effectively satisfies
the hopes of parents of both FL and [SL users at the same time that it satisfies
the needs of both FL and SL children[, providing them not only with the two-
language and two-culture skills that [are useful in today's world but, as Anna
Lietti (1989) of Switzerland puts it, wi[th "survival skills" for tomorrow's world.
As well, it makes a valuable place in th[e plan for both FL and SL specialists and
for their cooperative input. Since En[glish language arts as well as "heritage"
language arts are always involved, th[ere is a demand for the teaching of the
history, cultural values, and classical t[reasures of the target languages as well as
a technically up-to-date approach to cor[mmunicative facility and decontextualized
understanding of the languages.

How effective are these pro[grams? Numerous states have imple-
mented two-way bilingual immersion [programs, but results from longitudinal
research are just beginning to appear[. Individual programs are described in
detail in two recent reviews, one for t[he West Coast (California State Depart-
ment of Education, 1990) and one for t[he East Coast (Massachusetts Department
of Education, 1990). Charles Glenn ([1990) gives a valuable overview. Tucker
(1990) notes that these programs "h[old great promise for building and for
sustaining natural language resources[within the United States," resources so
valuable and precious for the SL user.[At the same time, these programs offer
opportunities for the FL user also to [develop real bilingual skills.

What do the results so far show? Data on the San Diego study, the oldest example, are available through grade six. In this program, mixed classes of Anglo and Hispanic children are taught mainly in Spanish from preschool through grade five, limiting English to thirty minutes a day in kindergarten and to sixty minutes in grades two and three. English instruction increases for grades four through six up to one-half day, so that some content areas (reading, math, social studies) are taught through both languages, but the languages are always separated during any particular lesson. Throughout, cross-language peer tutoring is instituted (see Lindholm & Fairchild, 1989).

The results are impressive. In the upper grade levels, both the Anglo children and the Hispanic children (who were originally classified as LEP) were either at or above mean percentiles, based on national norms, in reading achievement in both languages and in mathematics achievement tested in both languages.

The native Spanish-speaking students in the two-way classes performed:

> above national norms in Spanish-language reading, and English-language math. In English reading, they averaged only slightly below national norms (46th percentile at grade 6). More important, all students made gains on the national norms, on all achievement measures, thus reversing the national trends of increasing between-group achievement disparities at higher grade levels (Lindholm & Fairchild, 1089, p21).

In other words, the language minority children in this and other comparable programs in California are given a new lease on education. Compared to what they would have done had they been in an all-English, sink-or-swim option or in an early-exit transitional bilingual education option, they are close to or above national norms in both English and Spanish. Since they score significantly above comparison groups of same-ethnic peers who were not in a two-way program and who thus would have had little opportunity to become fully literate in Spanish, their developing bilinguality has apparently helped them move up to national norms, providing them with genuine academic and linguistic "survival skills" for further education and for employment.

How about the anglophones in the San Diego study? By the nature of things in multicultural America, the Anglos are predictably children from more privileged socioeconomic backgrounds, and this advantage is reflected in their high percentile scores in English reading and English mathematics (74 percent

and 83 percent), as would be expected (see California State Department of Education, 1990). But who would have expected them to do this well in English and mathematics (significantly better than their Anglo peers who were not in two-way bilingual immersion programs) since so much of their education, especially the first three years, was received through Spanish? They also score extremely high (72 percent and 81 percent) on tests of Spanish reading and Spanish math, which means that they are leaving elementary school with two languages in their repertory of skills — two for the price of one. They, too, have powerful survival skills to build on for their world of tomorrow.

Suggestions for Designs of Future Studies

Because the studies so far available are impressive and because they cater to the needs of both SL and FL users, a great deal of care is needed in documenting their strong and weak points and their generalizability to various sites across the nation. To make these studies resistant to peer-review criticism (see Gray, 1990, for a balanced appraisal), program evaluations need to be longitudinal in nature and they should involve carefully matched control groups of minority and mainstream children who are not in two-way immersion classes. Relying on national norms is too approximative because with norms it is difficult to create appropriate control groups who are matched on variables such as academic and intellectual potential and especially socioeconomic background.

There is a need also to equate the language minority and mainstream children who are mixed in two-way classes on social class backgrounds because, as is the case in several California-based programs, mainstream anglophone children more often have a clear socioeconomic advantage over Hispanic children and this could generate invidious comparisons which could in time deplete the academic self-esteem of the minority children. This means that Hispanic children from higher socioeconomic backgrounds should be sought out for inclusion and that more workingclass anglophone mainstream children should be included. There is no reason why less advantaged mainstream youngsters should not achieve as well as the more advantaged middle class children. For instance, in a recent longitudinal study of a partial French immersion program for inner city Cincinnati (Genesee, Holobow, Lambert, & Chartrand, 1990; Holobow, Genesee, & Lambert, 1990), the working class subsamples performed as well in tests of French skill after a three-year period as did the middle class groups, and black students performed as well as whites. Since working class and black children have greater needs for survival skills, these findings and the main point they demonstrate are important.

Finally, regional differences in the different ways two-way immersion programs are implemented will become important in the long-range evalua-

tion. Presently, the East Coast is as involved as the West (see La Lyre, 1990). In Cambridge, Massachusetts, the Amigos two-way bilingual program is now in its fourth year, and it is used as a model by a number of other Massachusetts communities (e.g., Lawrence, Salem, Chelsea, Boston, Fall River) which have initiated or are about to initiate similar educational offerings. The Amigos program (see La Lyre, 1990, pp. 28-46) uses matched comparison groups, and it has similar socioeconomic profiles for the language minority and mainstream participants. The results to date are extremely promising, not only in developing bilingual competence for both SL and FL user groups and in maintaining age-appropriate academic achievement, but also in fostering more democratic, less ethnocentric inter-ethnic-group attitudes among the children enrolled.

The two-way immersion option is intrinsically attractive, and as other communities become involved (see Crawford, 1989), with their own distinctive ethnic, racial, and linguistic contexts, the real value and effectiveness of this new American attempt to improve the life chances of all its children — FL users and SL users — will be watched carefully and tested from every possible angle.

In summary, what I have attempted to do here is to highlight basic differences between FL and SL education in terms of the purposes, aims, and training of specialists and in terms of the quite different populations of people who are the recipients or users of FL in contrast to SL education. By exaggerating the contrasts between the FL and SL fields, one is able to discern a bifurcation and separation of purposes that dilutes the effectiveness of language education at a time in U.S. history when the demands for better language training, conducted within a restricted time frame, are increasing and posing serious social problems in the society.

In order to meet these demands and to deal with the time available for an adequate total education of young people, a plan for improvement is offered wherein FL and SL specialities are used collaboratively to implement two-way bilingual immersion programs in public schools so that the language needs of children in SL programs can be satisfied without short-changing them in terms of their heritage language or in their education in critical subject matters and so that, simultaneously, children needing FL education can also develop high level two-language and two-culture competence.

REFERENCES

Alba, R.D. (1981). The twilight of ethnicity among American Catholics of European ancestry. Annals of the American Academy of Political Social Science, 454, 86-97.

Blake, L., Lambert, W.E., Sidoti, N., & Wolfe, D. (1981). Students' views of intergroup tensions in Quebec: The effects of language immersion experience. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 13, 144-160.

California State Department of Education. (1990). Bilingual immersion education: A program for the year 2000 and beyond. Sacramento: Bilingual Education Office.

Chira, S. (1990, May 22). New York's clamor intrudes on Korean's insularity. New York Times.

Cohen, A.D. 1974. The Culver City Spanish immersion program: The first two years. The Modern Language Journal, 58, 95-103.

Crandall, J., & Tucker, G.R. (1989). Content-based language instruction in second and foreign languages. Paper presented at RELC Regional Seminar, Singapore.

Crawford, J. (1989). Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice. Trenton, NJ: Crane Publishing Co.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. Harvard Educational Review, 56, 18-36.

Cummins, J. (1987). Bilingualism, language proficiency, and metalinguistic developments. In P. Homel, M. Paliz, and D. Aaronson (Eds.), Childhood bilingualism: Aspects of linguistic, cognitive, and social development. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 57-73.

Cziko, G., Lambert, W.E., Sidoti, N., & Tucker, G.R. (1980). Graduates of early immersion: Retrospective views of grade 11 students and their parents. In R. St. Clair and H. Giles (Eds.), The social and psychological contexts of language. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Lawrence Associates, Inc.

Dub*, N.C., & Herbert, G. (1975). Evaluation of the St. John Valley Title VII bilingual education program, 1970-75. Madawaska, Maine. Mimeo, The St. John Bilingual Education Project, 1975: Washington, DC: United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Ellis, R. (1986). Understanding second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Esman, M.J. (1987). Ethnic politics and economic power. Comparative Politics, 19, 395-417.

Ferguson, C.A. (in press). Conference synthesis. In B. Freed (Ed.), Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom. New York: D.C. Heath.

Ferguson, C., & Huebner, T. (1989). Foreign language instruction and second language acquisition research in the United States. NFLC Occasional Papers, 1-9.

Freed, B.F. 1990 (in press). Current realities and future prospects. In B. Freed (Ed.), Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom. NY: D.C. Heath.

Gans, H. 1979. Symbolic ethnicity: The future of ethnic groups and culture in America. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 2, 1-20.

Gass, (in press). As quoted in Contexts, processes, and products in second language acquisition and foreign language acquisition. In B. van Patten and J.F. Lee (Eds.), Second language acquisition and foreign language learning. Clevedon, UK.

Genesee, F. (1987). Learning through two languages. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Genesee, F., Holobow, N., & Lambert, W.E. (1990). The effectiveness of a foreign language immersion program for children from different ethnic and social class backgrounds, Applied Psycholinguistics.

Genesee, F., Holobow, Lambert, W.E., & Chartrand, L. (1989). Three elementary school alternatives for learning through a second language. The Modern Language Journal, 73, 250-263.

Genesee, F., & Lambert, W.E. (1983). Trilingual education for majority language children. Child Development, 54, 105-114.

Glazer, N., & Moynihan, D.P. (1970). Beyond the melting pot. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Glenn, C.L. (1990, May). How to integrate bilingual education without tracking. The School Administrator, 28-31.

Gordon, M.M. (1964). Assimilation in American life. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gray, T. (1990). Issue brief on effective strategies for teaching English to students from language minority backgrounds. Mimeo, Policy Studies Associates, Inc. for United States Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation.

Greely, A.M. (1974). Ethnicity in the United States: A preliminary reconnaissance. New York: Wiley.

Grittner, F. 1985. Personal communication.

Hart, D.S., Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. (1987). Early and middle French immersion programs: Linguistic outcomes and social character. Toronto, Ontario: Metropolitan Toronto School Board.

Herbert, C.H. (1986). Final evaluation report, bilingual basic grant project, ESEA Title VII. San Diego: San Diego City Schools.

Hirschman, C. 1983. America's melting pot reconsidered. Annual Review of Sociology, 9, 397-423.

Holobow, N., Lambert, W.E., & Genesee, F. (1985-1987). Kahnawake test results: Spring, 1985, 1986, 1987. Mimeo, Psychology Department, McGill University.

Jorden, E. (in press). The use of interactive video in the learning of Japanese. In B. Freed (Ed.), Foreign language acquisition research and the classroom. New York: D.C. Heath.

Kramsch, C. (in press). As quoted in Contexts, processes, and products in second language acquisition and foreign language acquisition. In B. van Patten and J.F. Lee (Eds.), Second language acquisition and foreign language learning. Clevedon, UK.

La Lyre, Y. (Ed.) (1990). Two-way integrated bilingual education. Quincy, MA: Massachusetts Department of Education, Office of Education Equity.

Lambert, W.E. (1974a). An alternative to the foreign language teaching profession. In H. Altman and V. Hanzeli (Eds.), Essays on the teaching of culture: A festschrift to honor Howard Lee Nostrand. Detroit, MI: Advancement Press of America, Inc.

Lambert, W.E. (1974b). Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In F.E. Aboud and R.D. Meade (Eds.), The Fifth Western Symposium on Learning. Bellingham, Washington: Western Washington State College.

Lambert, W.E. (1988, May 6-9). "Mino rity" language rights and education in Quebec. Paper presented at a conferenc e on Minority Language Rights and Minority Education, Cornell University.

Lambert, W.E. (1978). Some cognitiv e and sociocultural consequences of being bilingual. In J.E. Alatis (Ed.), I nternational dimensions of bilingual education. Washington, DC: Georgeto wn University Press.

Lambert, W.E. (1984). An overview o f issues in immersion education. In Studies on immersion education: A co llection for United States educators. Sacramento, CA: California State Depa rtment of Education.

Lambert, W.E., Genesee, F., Holobow w, N., & McGilly, C. (1984). An evaluation of a partial Mohawk immersio n program to the Kahnawake schools. Mimeo, Psychology Department, McGi ll University.

Lambert, W.E., Giles, H., & Albert, G.J. (1976). Language attitudes in a rural city in northern Maine. La Mondo Lingu o Problemo, 5, No. 15, 129-139, The Hague: Mouton.

Lambert, W.E., Giles H., & Picard, O. (1 975). Language attitudes in a French-American community. International Jou rnal of the Sociology of Language, 4, 127-152.

Lambert, W.E., Holobow, N., Genesee, F., & Chartrand, L. (1990). Bilingual education for English speaking children. Mimeo, Psychology Department, McGill University.

Lambert, W.E., & Taylor, D.M. (1988). Assimilation versus multiculturalism: The views of urban Americans. Sociolo gical Forum, 3, 72-88.

Lambert, W.E. & Taylor, D.M. (199 0). Coping with cultural and racial diversity in urban America. NY: Praeg er Publishers.

Lambert, W.E., & Taylor, D.M. (1987). Language minorities in the United States: Conflicts around assimilation and d proposed modes of accommodation. In W.A. van Horne & T.V. Tonnes sen (Eds.), Ethnicity and language. Milwaukee, WI: The University of Wi sconsin System, Institute of Race and Ethnicity.

Lambert, W.E., & Tucker, G.R. (1972). Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lederer, W.J., & Burdick, E. (1958). The ugly American. NY: Norton.
Lietti, A. (1989). Pour l'education bilingue: Guide de survive a l'usage des petits Europeens. Lausanne, Switzerland: Favre, S.A.

Lindholm, K.J. (1990a). Academic and language achievement of Hispanic and Anglo students after three years in a two-way bilingual/immersion program. Paper presented at the Conference of the California Association for Bilingual Education, San Francisco, CA.

Lindholm, K.J. (1990b). Bilingual immersion education: Criteria for program development. In A.M. Padilla, H.H. Fairchild, and C.M. Valadez (Eds.), Bilingual education: Issues and strategies. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publication, 91-105.

Lindholm, K.J. (1990c, April). Two-way bilingual/immersion education. Theory, conceptual issues, and pedagogical implications. Paper presented at a symposium on Critical Perspectives on Bilingual Education Research, Phoenix, Arizona.

Lindholm, K.J., & Fairchild, H.H. (1989). Evaluation of an "exemplary" bilingual immersion program. Technical Report No. 13. Los Angeles: UCLA Center for Language Education and Research.

Littlewood, W. (1984). Foreign and second language learning. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Nostrand, F.B. (1974). Teaching the foreign culture: A conjugal retrospection. In H.B. Altman and V. Hanzeli (Eds.), Essays on the teaching of culture: A festschrift to honor Howard Lee Nostrand. Detroit, MI: Advancement Press of America, Inc.

Novak, R.D. (1972). The rise of the unmeltable ethnics. New York: Macmillan.

Park, R.E., & Burgess, E.W. (1921). Introduction to the science of sociology. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Parker, W.R. (1967). Why a foreign language requirement? In J. Michel (Ed.), Foreign language teaching. New York: Macmillan Co.

Popper, K.R. (1967). The open society and its enemies, Vols. 1 and 2. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ramirez, D., Yuen, S.D., & Ramey, D.R. (1989). Final report: Longitudinal study of immersion strategy, early-exit and late-exit transitional bilingual education for language-minority children. San Mateo, CA: Aquirre International, November 1989.

Swain, M. (1974). French immersion across Canada. Canadian Modern Language Review, 31, 117-128.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1990). Additive bilingualism and French immersion education: The roles of language proficiency and literacy. In A. Reynolds (Ed.), Bilingualism, multiculturalism, and second language learning: Essays in honor of W.E. Lambert. New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Taylor, D.M., & Lambert, W.E. (in progress). Assimilation versus multiculturalism: The Miami study. Psychology Department, McGill University.

Taylor, D.M., Meynard, R., & Rheault, E. (1977). Threat to ethnic identity and second-language learning. In H. Giles (Ed.), Language, ethnicity and intergroup relations. New York: Academic Press.

Thomas, S. (1980). A language to share. Newton, MA: Educational Development Center, Inc.

Tucker, G.R. (1980). Comments on proposed rules for nondiscrimination under programs receiving federal financial assistance through the Education Department. Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Tucker, G.R. (in press). Cognitive and social correlates of bilinguality. In R.L. Cooper and B. Spolsky (Eds.), Language, society, and thought: Essays in honor of Ioshua A. Fishman's sixty-fifth birthday. Mouton de Gruyter.

van Patten, B., (1988). Theory and research in second language acquisition and foreign language learning: On producers and consumers. Ideal, 3, 99-109.

van Patten, B. & Lee, J.F. (in press). Contexts, processes, and products in second language acquisition and foreign language learning. In B. van Patten and J.K. Lee (Eds.), Second language acquisition and foreign language learning. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Wong, S.C. (1987). The language needs of school-age Asian immigrants and refugees in the United States. In W.A. van Horne & T.V. Tonnesen (Eds.), Ethnicity and language. Milwaukee, WI: The University of Wisconsin System, Institute on Race and Ethnicity.

Wylie, L.W. (1966). Chanzeaux: A village in Anjou. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wylie, L.W. (1957). Village in the Vaucluse. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.